Attorney Docket P-2260

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending and stand rejected and are therefore at issue.

# Support for the Amendments

The Specification is amended to correct an obvious and inadvertent clerical error and is supported at least by the remainder of the same paragraph of the Specification as originally filed.

Claims 1 and 32 are amended to recite "presenting recorded time information a time accounting system to a user." This amendment is supported at least by the Title, the Abstract, and throughout the Specification.

No new matter is added.

### **Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the Figure 4 for failing to show "task items 406A-E" as described in the Specification. Applicant respectfully submits that the inadvertent clerical error was in the Specification and not in Figure 4. Accordingly, the Specification is amended to no longer describe "task items 406A-E." Instead, the Specification as amended describes "task items 402A-E" which is consistent with other references in the Specification to the same "task items" and with Figure 4 as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to the Specification overcomes the Examiner's objection to Figure 4.

Page 12 of 15

Attorney Docket P-2260

### The Claims are Allowable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-33 in view of Goyal et al. (U.S. Patent 5,873,108) alone or in combination with other references. The Examiner also rejected Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Claim 1 recites "displaying, in association with the time line, two or more session graphical representations wherein each of the session graphical representations: represents a respective contiguous block of time *spent* by a person on a respective one of two or more tasks." (emphasis supplied). Thus, Claim 1 recites a time reporting system, not a calendaring system in which prospective appointments, to-do items, etc. are scheduled prior to taking place. In addition, Claim 1 is amended to recite that the method presents "recorded time information of a time accounting system".

The distinction is subtle but important. Looking ahead at one's schedule, it's useful to see what the overall character of the upcoming schedule might be. However, recording time spent on tasks in the past is conventionally thought of as merely an exercise in accounting. After all, what really matters is how many hours the professional will bill each client for each respective task. At the time the instant invention was made, conventional time accounting systems represented time in tabular columns. What is missing from the current record is a motivation or suggestion to use some of the GUI techniques of calendaring/scheduling applications in a time recording environment.

Goyal et al. specifically teach forward-looking scheduling: e.g., appointments and to-do

Attorney Docket P-2260

tasks at column 4. Other references cited by the Examiner similarly teach calendaring/scheduling systems and evidence no appreciation for the use of timelines and graphical user interfaces for modifying records representing time spent in the past on a particular task for a time accounting system.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-33 recite, directly or indirectly, language similar to that described above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 2-33 are similarly allowable over the cited references.

Attorney Docket P-2260

# Conclusion

Claims 1-33 are now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next action is other than for allowance of Claims 1-33 or if the Examiner has any questions or comments with respect to the above identified case, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned at (510) 336-1100.

Respectfully submitted,

James D. Ivey
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37,016

IVEY, SMITH & RAMIREZ 3025 TOTTERDELL STREET OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94611-1742 VOICE: (510) 336-1100 FACSIMILE: (510) 336-1122

/home/james/ISR/LawPractice/Files/2260p/06OA/ResponsetoOfficeAction.sxw

Page 15 of 15